----Original Message-----

From: Scully, William CNAE [mailto:William.C.Scully@usace.army.mil]

Sent: Friday, July 15, 2016 2:49 PM

To: Hamjian, Lynne < Hamjian, Lynne < href="mailto:Hamjian.Lynne@epa.gov">Hamjian, Lynne < href="mailto:Hamjian.Lynne@epa.gov">Hamjian, Lynne @epa.gov >; Brochi, Jean < Brochi.Jean@epa.gov >

Cc: Cote, Mel <Cote.Mel@epa.gov>; ELIS <ELIS@epa.gov>; Acone, Scott E NAE

<<u>Scott.E.Acone@usace.army.mil</u>>; Habel, Mark L NAE <<u>Mark.L.Habel@usace.army.mil</u>>; Wolf, Steven NAE <<u>Steven.Wolf@usace.army.mil</u>>; O'Donnell, Edward GNAE <<u>Edward.G.Odonnell@usace.army.mil</u>>;

Barron, Christopher J COL NAE < christopher J COL NAE < christopher.J.Barron.COL@usace.army.mil>

Subject: RE: Comment Period for Proposed Eastern Long Island Sound Dredged Material Disposal Site

Lynne:

Thank you for the call this morning to assure that we understood that you (EPA) were accepting any comments that folks may have with regard to the Niantic and Cornfield Shoals sites in addition to, of course, any comment on the released Draft SEIS for Eastern LIS (which included a draft Rule). This email is in response to that call and provides our comments in specific regard to Cornfield Shoals.

We have specific concern over not including Cornfield Shoals as a designated disposal site in any final Rule for Eastern LIS. The Cornfield Shoals site is located off the mouth of the Connecticut River and has served for many decades as a dispersal site for cleaner dredged sediments from the several harbors in the lower Connecticut River and vicinity, including some frequently maintained harbors like North Cove and the Patchogue River. The alternatives for any open water placement of material dredged from those projects absent the availability of the Cornfield Shoals site would likely result in hauling the material a longer distance to either the Central LIS site or the proposed new Eastern LIS site, which would have significant cost impacts for our O&M program. The main objection we have heard to a dispersal site is that it would move material into NY waters and onto NY shorelines. The dispersal of clean materials, often sandy silts and silty sands not suitable for beach or nearshore bar no urishment uses due solely to grain size, should not be of concern - - and the claims that material migrates from the Cornfield Shoals site to NY beaches are, we believe, unsupported and unfounded. Furthermore, the availability of the Cornfield Shoals site would help extend the useful life of the Central and Eastern sites by reducing reliance on those sites for placement of materials suitable for Cornfield Shoals. We encourage EPA to consider the designation of the Cornfield Shoals site for continued use for sediments suitable for placement at a dispersive site.

Respectfully.

William C. Scully, P.E.
Deputy District Engineer
for Programs & Project Management
New England District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers